

to the Examiner's Attention by telephone after it was recently cited in copending patent application, Serial No. 09/245,711, and for considering the references submitted on May 17, 2001.

Applicants also acknowledge with appreciation the courtesies extended to Mr. Robert J. Webster, their undersigned representative, during the personal interview conducted on June 27, 2002. The remarks, below, contain the Applicant's summary of the interview.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation, the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3, 5 and 6. Claims 3, 5 and 6 have not been re-written in independent form, however, because Applicants believe that claim 1, from which these claims depend, is patentable for the reasons stated, below, and these claims are patentable at least for those reasons as well as being allowable in their own right.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly fails to provide support for "the first parameter quantity exceeding a threshold value predetermined therefor 'so as to counteract a further increase of the rolling amount by the deceleration of the vehicle' as claimed in lines 9-10 of amended claim 1." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A specification need not describe the claimed invention in ipsis verbis to comply with the written description requirement. See, In re Edwards, 568 F.2d 1349, 196 USPQ 465 (CCPA 1978). The test is whether the originally filed specification disclosure reasonably conveys to a person having ordinary skill that applicant had possession of the subject matter later claimed. See, In re Kaslow, 707 F.2d 1366, 217 USPQ 1089 (Fed. Cir. 1983). By the very nature of the inquiry under this statutory provision, each case turns on its own specific facts. See, In re Edwards, 568 F.2d at 1352, 196 USPQ at 467. As stated in In re Wilder, 736 F.2d 1516, 222 USPQ 369 (Fed. Cir. 1984), the inquiry into whether the description requirement is met must be determined on a case by case basis and is a question of fact.

Moreover, the examiner has the initial burden of presenting evidence or reasons why persons skilled in the art would not recognize in appellant's specification disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims. In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976), and Ex parte Sorenson, 3 USPQ2d 1462 (BD. Pat. App. & Int. 1987).

Here, the Office Action merely concludes, with absolutely no reasoning in support thereof, that certain claimed subject matter is not supported by a written description in the specification as filed. Quite clearly, the Office Action has not met the initial burden of presenting evidence why a person having ordinary skill in the art would not recognize in appellant's specification a description of the invention defined by the claims. In re Wertheim, *supra*.

This failure to present any reasoning in support of this bare conclusion of lack of written description of the quoted language denies Applicants' fundamental procedural and substantive due process required to be accorded Applicants under the Administrative Procedures Act. See, in this regard, In re Zurko, 119 S.Ct. 1816, 50 USPQ2d 1930 (1999), and In re Gartside, 53 USPQ2d 1769 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Accordingly, this rejection is fundamentally flawed and must be withdrawn.

In order to be completely responsive to this rejection, however, Applicants respectfully point out that in claim 1, recitation of "the brake system is actuated to accomplish a target deceleration of the vehicle when the first parameter quantity exceeds a threshold value predetermined therefor so as to counteract a further increase of the rolling amount by the deceleration of the vehicle" has support in Applicants' disclosure, although not in "*ipsis verbis*" or in "*haec verba*."

Applicants' original claim 1, which is part of Applicants' original disclosure (see MPEP §2163.02, Section III), recites all of the quoted language except "so as to counteract a further increase of the rolling amount by the deceleration of the vehicle." This

quoted language, i.e., to counteract a further increase of the rolling amount by the deceleration of the vehicle, is taught throughout Applicants' disclosure. All of these arguments were presented during the interview. However, the Examiner's Interview Summary only mentions that Applicants representative discussed the specification, page 1, lines 7-10. While page 1, lines 7-10 of the specification were discussed, the other portions of the specification mentioned above were also discussed.

Applicants' specification clearly discloses the field of invention to be "a device for controlling an over-rolling of a vehicle body of a vehicle such as an automobile, so as to prevent the vehicle from rolling over during its turn running." (see page 1, lines 6-10). The rolling of a vehicle during its turn running is due to a centrifugal force. The centrifugal force during a turn running of a vehicle increases along with the increase of vehicle speed according to well known principles of physics. The device disclosed in the present application prevents the vehicle from a rolling over during its turn running by braking the vehicle so that the centrifugal force is decreased in response to a deceleration of the vehicle. Therefore, as a matter of course and based on the laws of physics, a braking counteracts a further increase of the rolling amount. Counteracts is defined as "to oppose and mitigate the effects by a contrary action", American Heritage Dictionary, 2^D College Edition, 1985, page 331. Moreover, the invention is disclosed, on page 3, as setting the threshold value for a first parameter quantity indicative of a rolling amount of the vehicle body "...for the prevention of a rolling over of the vehicle..." (lines 15-20). Moreover, the Application clearly teaches applying the braking system to decelerate the vehicle to counteract roll-over of the vehicle (see the sentence bridging pages 3 and 4 of Applicants' specification). By definition, roll-over of the vehicle is a further increase of the rolling-over amount. Thus, the specification, if not explicitly using the word, implicitly uses the word by defining what happens.

The language in issue was added by Applicants to traverse the Examiner's contention in an earlier Office Action that Applicants' claim 1 is unpatentable over Taga et al. and another reference. The November 7, 2001 Office Action asserted that Taga et al. disclose a brake control comprising a means for providing a first parameter quantity of a variable amount of the vehicle or accelerator pedal angle signal for determining pedal position, a means for providing a second parameter quantity of a change rate of variable amount of a vehicle body or pedal releasing speed, and a means for controlling the brake system such that a target deceleration occurs when the first parameter quantity exceeds a threshold value, the target deceleration being increased according to an increase of the second parameter quantity or accelerator pedal releasing speed.

Taga et al. discloses actuating a regeneration system of an electrically driven vehicle or a hybrid vehicle in which engine braking is not available, so as to provide an engine braking feeling when the driver releases the accelerator pedal, by starting a regeneration action of a generator when the accelerator pedal was released from a depression, operating the generator at a higher rate as the speed of releasing the acceleration pedal depression is higher. The Office Action compared the return of the accelerator pedal to zero depression in Taga et al. to the rolling amount exceeding the threshold value in Applicants' claim 1, and the speed of releasing the depression of the accelerator pedal in Taga et al. to the change rate of the rolling amount of Applicants' claim 1.

In Taga et al., the engine brake feeling gets higher (stronger) as the regeneration action of the generator is intensified. In Taga et al., the regeneration action is controlled according to the speed of releasing an accelerator pedal depression so that the regeneration action is intensified as the speed of releasing an acceleration pedal is higher. However, Taga et al. does not control the regenerator such that the actuation of the regenerator counteracts a further increase of the brake pedal releasing. When the operation of the regenerator is

started, the brake pedal is fully released, leaving a record of how quickly the brake pedal was released, the record being used to determine how strongly to operate the regenerator. There is no analogy between Taga et al. and Applicants' claim 1 in regard to the relationship among the parameters concerned.

Indeed, however, the "counteraction" was explicitly recited to distinguish Applicants' claim 1 with respect to Taga et al. The invention of Applicants' claim 1 is not simply in such a counteraction. Rather, it comprises a particular combination of the first parameter quantity indicative of a rolling amount of the vehicle body and the second parameter quantity indicative of a change rate of the rolling amount of the vehicle body such that the breaking for a roll-over control is executed according to the change rate of the rolling amount, as started by the rolling amount exceeding a threshold value, so that the deceleration is controlled to a target value which is increased according to an increase of the change rate of rolling amount, with a restriction of the target value between predetermined maximum and minimum values.

Thus, Applicants were in possession of the claimed invention when the application was filed, and the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, is improper and should be withdrawn.

The change rate of the rolling amount is quicker than the rolling amount in responding to changes of rolling condition. Therefore, it provides a great advantage that the roll control is executed based upon the change rate of the rolling amount. However, the change rate of the rolling amount floats and is not proportional to the absolute magnitude of the rolling amount. Therefore, Applicants devised a control based on the change rate of the rolling amount related to the absolute magnitude of the rolling by starting the control when the magnitude exceeds a threshold value predetermined therefor. Such a roll-over control, which is based on a particular combination of the rolling amount and the change rate of the rolling

amount, is a very effective roll-over control, is not shown in the prior art applied by the Examiner, and is not obvious in view of the applied art, taken alone or in combination.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges that the phrase "the target value of the deceleration" in the third to last line of claim 1 is indefinite. The Office Action asks whether the "target value of the deceleration" should be read as "target value of the target deceleration." Applicants respectfully submit that the terms "target deceleration" in claim 1, line 8, and the terms "target value of the deceleration" in claim 1, line 10 have the same meaning. Applicants never use the terminology "target value of the target deceleration" in the disclosure, including the claims, so that interpretation of "target value of the target deceleration" is not supported in the disclosure, and therefore would not be considered as plausible by, or even make sense to, one of ordinary skill in the art in determining the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

In view of these considerations, Applicants respectfully submit that the metes and bounds of the claimed invention are clear, and that this rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite the language which the Interview Summary indicates was agreed upon to overcome the rejection. It should be noted, however, that this agreement was only made conditioned on the Examiner's agreement that the amended claim language was of the same scope as the changed language. That agreement was made but is not found in the Examiner's Interview Summary.

WITHDRAWAL OF PREMATURE FINAL REJECTION

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,890,084 to Halasz et al. (hereinafter, "Halasz") in view of Harada et al.

(JP 10-278762, corresponding to U.S. Patent 6,081,761 throughout the Office Action for column and line numbers - hereinafter, "Harada"). This rejection is respectfully traversed - see below.

Initially, Applicants note that the amendment of claim 1, in the Amendment filed February 6, 2002, does not alter the scope of the claim. Rather, addition of "so as to counteract a further increase of the rolling amount by the deceleration of the vehicle" merely adds to the body of the claim what is already recited in the claim preamble, i.e., that the type of control is a control of an over-rolling of a vehicle, and in the body of the claim, i.e., deceleration of the vehicle. This quoted feature was already in the claim.

The word "value" was added to claim 1 merely to indicate that the target deceleration is quantifiable. It does not alter the scope of the claim.

Because the claim has not changed in scope, it was improper to add yet another new reference and use it as the basis for a rejection of claim 1 without making the rejection non-final to accord Applicant an opportunity to amend the claim. Accordingly, the finality of this Office Action should be withdrawn.

Moreover, to treat the added material in the amendment to claim 1 on its merits is inconsistent with the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, which indicates that there is no proper basis for the amendment in the disclosure. The Examiner's position in the final rejection is that the amendments to claim 1 have no proper basis in the disclosure. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1 and 2 cannot take the material added by amendment into account in making the rejection based on prior art.

Accordingly, the final rejection of claims 1 and 2 based on the newly applied reference to Halasz et al. was not made based on the amendments to the claim (which cannot be given patentable weight according to the rejection under 35 USC §112, first paragraph).

Therefore the finality of the rejection based on the newly cited and applied reference to Halasz et al. is premature and must be withdrawn.

Additionally, the Examiner now states in the Interview Summary that Halasz's teaching of "about 1G to about 5G's" in col. 7, line 36 functions as a predetermined minimum while the "greater than 5G's functions as the predetermined maximum."

Applicants respectfully submit that this is a new ground of rejection, not previously stated in the final rejection, and is another reason why the finality of the outstanding Office Action must be withdrawn.

Upon withdrawal of the premature finality of the outstanding rejection, the Amendments made above should be entered as a matter of right under 37 CFR §1.111.

RESPONSE TO THE MERITS OF THE REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §102(b)

Turning to the merits of the traversed rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC §103(a) over Halasz in view of Harada, Halasz fails to decelerate the vehicle or to otherwise try to prevent the overturning of the vehicle, features which are positively recited in the claims, and does not seek to "accomplish a target deceleration of the vehicle," as recited.

The Interview Summary stresses that both Halasz and Harada protect the passenger. However, what is recited in the claims is not a device to protect a passenger, but a device for controlling over-rolling of a vehicle (regardless of whether that vehicle has a live human passenger or a dummy passenger or is remote controlled). Halasz simply does not try to counteract a further increase of the rolling amount by deceleration of the vehicle, as recited.

To remedy these clear deficiencies, the Office Action turns to Harada, which states that it "...relates to an automatic deceleration control method and apparatus for automatically decelerating a turning vehicle, thereby stabilizing the turning behavior of the vehicle." (see col. 1, lines 8-11).

The Office Action alleges that it would be obvious to have modified Halasz in view of Harada to include a prevention of over-rolling of a vehicle to provide vehicle stability. As modified, Halasz is said to teach the feature of actuating the brake system to accomplish a brake deceleration when the first parameter (alleged to be roll-angle as disclosed in col. 6, lines 12, 13, 15, 16) exceeds a threshold so as to counteract a further increase in the rolling amount by deceleration of the vehicle to the same extent as Applicants.

Harada et al. is directed to deceleration control for a large turning vehicle, such as a truck or bus, to restrain it from excessive rolling (col. 1, lines 36-51). Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to provide proper motivation to combine the teaching of these references. The first requirement of proper motivation is that a showing of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine the prior art references is an “essential evidentiary component of an obviousness holding.” C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys. Inc., 157 F.3d 1340, 1352, 48 USPQ2d 1225, 1232 (Fed. Cir. 1998). This evidence may flow from the prior art references themselves, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or, in some cases, from the nature of the problem to be solved. See Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc., 75 F.3d 1568, 1573, 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1630 (Fed. Cir. 1996). However, the suggestion more often comes from the teachings of the pertinent references. See In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1359, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1998). This showing must be clear and particular, and broad conclusory statements about the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not “evidence.” See Dembiczak, 175 F.3d at 1000, 50 USPQ2d at 1617.

Halasz is totally devoid of active control of the vehicle movement, and makes no attempt to control the vehicle running characteristics, such as roll-over. Instead, Halasz is limited to letting the vehicle roll-over and merely actuating an occupant safety device such as “a seat belt pretensioner mechanism, an air bag, an automatic roll-over bay, a door lock or a

cellular phone" (see the Abstract and Background of the Invention, col. 1, lines 1-21).

Moreover, Halasz is directed to a "sudden change in acceleration, pitch angle or roll angle of a vehicle" (emphasis added) (col. 1, lines 8-12), and uses filters responsive to a frequency band "...corresponding to or representing acceleration indicative of an impact due to a collision." (col. 6, lines 55-58). Vehicles in collisions are not likely candidates for the teachings of Harada, which are directed to decelerating vehicles which are not disclosed as being involved in collisions.

Moreover, Applicants' representative did not state during the interview that Halasz was not concerned with over rolling, as stated in the Interview Summary. What Applicants' representative stated was that Halasz was not concerned with the over rolling of the vehicle in the sense of controlling the over rolling. Halasz is interested in determining whether a vehicle is going to roll over but makes no attempt to reduce the tendency of, or prevent, the over rolling of the vehicle. Halasz is completely devoid of controlling the tendency of the vehicle to over roll. Halasz's disclosure is only directed to activating one or more safety devices to protect a passenger in the vehicle "in case of a roll-over or pitch-over movement" (col. 4, lines 56-60), and discloses a method and apparatus for predicting roll-overs and pitch-over movements in motor vehicles (col. 4, lines 61-65).

In order to modify Halasz, as suggested in the Office Action, one would have to completely redesign Halasz, who does not disclose or suggest actuating a vehicle roll-over control. There is no suggestion in Halasz, nor is there any suggestion in Harada to do this. Moreover, there is a disincentive to combine the references, Halasz being directed roll-over and pitch-over movements generated by sudden impacts from a collision, and Harada not being directed to rolling over due to sudden impacts, e.g., collisions. The only suggestion to combine these references is hindsight reconstruction of Applicants' invention, which is improper. Halasz is not at all concerned with trying to control the vehicle to reduce its

tendency to roll-over and, therefore, is not at all concerned with brake control, let alone a brake control in which a target determined by a parameter counteracts the parameter.

Moreover, even if the references were somehow combined, they would not disclose or suggest the feature of "wherein the target value of the deceleration is increased from a predetermined minimum value to a predetermined maximum value according to an increase of the second parameter quantity." This feature is not even addressed in the rejection, so the rejection is fatally flawed in this regard, as well as being improper for the reasons stated above.

The Examiner has had time to consider the arguments made by Applicants' representative during the interview and discuss them with a Primary Examiner and now states in the Interview Summary that Halasz's teaching of "about 1G to about 5G's" in col. 7, line 36 functions as a predetermined minimum while the "greater than 5G's functions as the predetermined maximum."

Applicants respectfully submit that this is a new ground of rejection, not previously stated in the final rejection, and is another reason why the finality of the outstanding Office Action must be withdrawn.

In response to this interpretation of the Halasz reference, Applicants initially point out that Halasz fails to disclose (1) deceleration or (2) a target value of deceleration, as recited in the claims. Therefore, even if Halasz were to disclose a target value of the deceleration is increased from a predetermined minimum value to a predetermined maximum value according to an increase in the second parameter quantity, Halasz would not disclose claim features (1) and (2).

Applicants respectfully contend that Halasz also does not disclose a target value of the deceleration is increased from a predetermined minimum value to a predetermined maximum value according to an increase in the second parameter quantity.

The Office Action contends that Halasz's first parameter quantity without stating that the parameter is the y-axis roll angle as disclosed in col. 6, lines 12, 13, 15 and 16 and that the second parameter quantity is y-axis acceleration of the rolling amount of the vehicle as disclosed in col. 6, lines 39-41. The Office Action indicates that Halasz generates a control signal (actuation of one vehicular safety device) when the first parameter quantity exceeds a threshold value as disclosed in col. 7, lines 18-19. Applicants note that the claim does not recite merely generating a control signal, but recite means for controlling of the brake system to counteract the over rolling of the vehicle. The Office Action states that the control is increased (activation of another control device) according to an increase of the second parameter quantity (y-axis acceleration) as disclosed in col. 7, lines 36-46 (which states that a second control signal generator generates a first control signal when the G force exceeds a second predetermined value such as from about 1G to 5G's and a thirds control signal when the G force sensed by the sensor means exceeds a second predetermined value greater than 5G's).

The Office Action is disregarding the explicit claim language. The claim calls for increasing the target value of the deceleration from a predetermined minimum to a predetermined maximum according to an increase of the second parameter quantity. In Halasz, there is no concept of (1) deceleration or (2) a target value of deceleration, or (3) a predetermined minimum target value of deceleration, or (4) a predetermined maximum target value of deceleration. Halasz only discloses different thresholds of roll-over or pitch-over values at which different safety devices are triggered. Halasz's first control signal generator 42 triggers a first safety device when either the pitch angle and pitch angle rate exceed a predetermined value indicative of a pitch over condition, or when the roll angle and roll angle rate exceed a predetermined roll-over condition. Halasz's second control generator actuates

first and second signals to trigger one safety device when the G force exceeds a second predetermined value, and to trigger another safety device when the G force exceeds a third threshold value.

Applicants' representative also argued, during the interview, that the rejection improperly compares an increase in vehicular behavior parameter, such as deceleration of a vehicle, to an increase of the variety of safety devices operated in parallel, completely disregarding the technical concept of control, and only relying on a verbal format of expression. Applicants representative also pointed out that the number of safety devices operated in parallel by Halasz is not controlled according to a change rate of the number of safety devices operated in parallel. At this point in the interview, Examiner Burch interrupted this argument, not appearing to be persuaded by it. This argument by Applicants' representative is not discussed in the Advisory Action. Applicants continue with this argument, which they believe is persuasive, by also pointing out that, in Halasz, the control of changing the number of safety devices operated in parallel is not started when the number has changed from its standard or neutral state beyond a threshold value to be comparable to the features recited in claim 1 because, since any change in the number of safety devices operated in parallel is a result of the control itself, the control can never start as a matter of logic.

A fair, balanced appraisal of the rejection shows that the Halasz, the primary reference, is totally devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of (1) deceleration or (2) a target value of deceleration, or (3) a predetermined minimum target value of deceleration, or (4) a predetermined maximum target value of deceleration, or (5) increasing the target value of deceleration from a predetermined minimum to a predetermined maximum according to an increase of the second parameter quantity.

Nor does Harada provide these features. Nor is there any proper motivation to combine these references. The Advisory Action indicates that both Halasz and Harada

monitor over-rolling parameters to determine the actuation of a vehicular safety device and that the combination merely included the modification of the vehicle safety device of Halasz with the vehicle safety device of Harada which is capable of achieving a target deceleration. This is the type of broad conclusionary statement that is insufficient to motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to add Harada's automatic deceleration system to Halasz - see Dembiczak, cited above.

With respect to claim 2, Halasz discloses measuring three parameters, only one of which is lateral acceleration, and lateral acceleration (around the Z-axis) is not disclosed in col. 7 as being a parameter used to generate the first control signal. There is no indication in either reference to select the first parameter as one which is proportional to lateral acceleration, as recited.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Halasz in view of Harada is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Halasz in view of Harada (as applied in the rejection of claim 1) and further to in view of Ikemoto et al. (U.S. 4,807,128 - hereinafter "Ikemoto")). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, it is noted that to the extent that the rejection is based on the reference combination of Halasz and Harada, it is improper for the reasons stated above regarding claim 1, from which claim 4 depends.

Ikemoto is applied to teach, in col. 3, line 28, the use of rate of change of the steering angle in the control of vehicle over-roll. The Office Action asserts that it would be obvious to modify the second parameter quantity indicative of a change rate of the variable amount of the vehicle body of Halasz to include a rate of change of the steering angle as taught by Ikemoto to provide an alternate parameter for triggering the necessary target deceleration control.

Ikemoto merely measures the rate of change of the steering angle as one of any inputs to predict the roll angle of the vehicle. Neither Halasz nor Harada include such a parameter in their devices. Halasz never mentions using a steering angle. Harada appears content to simply use the steering wheel angle and compute a steering wheel angular speed (col. 8, lines 40-64). There is no proper motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify either reference to measure the change rate of the steering angle. The assertion that one could use this parameter as an alternative is, at best, an assertion that it might be feasible, but not that it would be desirable. The only teaching of the desirability of using such a parameter is found in Applicants' disclosure. Thus, the reference combination of Halasz., Harada and Ikemoto is improper and does not render the claimed subject matter obvious for the reasons stated above.

Claim 7 has been added. It is an earlier version of claim 1, without the material which the Examiner indicates has no basis in the disclosure, i.e., without the content that serves as the basis for the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph. This claim is patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable, as set forth above, and is presented to reduce and/or simplify issues for purposes of appeal.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1, 2 and 4 under 35 USC §103(a) be withdrawn, and claims 1-7 allowed.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Robert J. Webster
Registration No. 46,472

JAO:RJW/alp

Attachment:
Appendix

Date: July 24, 2002

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--

APPENDIX

Changes to Claims:

The following is a marked-up version of amended claim 1:

1. (Thrice Amended) A device for controlling an over-rolling of a vehicle having a vehicle body, wheels, a steering system, and a brake system, the device comprising:
 - means for providing a first parameter quantity indicative of a rolling amount of the vehicle body,
 - means for providing a second parameter quantity indicative of a change rate of the rolling amount of the vehicle body, and
 - means for controlling of the brake system such that the brake system is actuated to accomplish a target deceleration of the vehicle when the first parameter quantity exceeds a threshold value predetermined therefor so as to counteract a further increase of the rolling amount by the deceleration of the vehicle, wherein a value of the target ~~value of the~~ deceleration is increased from a predetermined minimum value to a predetermined maximum value according to an increase of the second parameter quantity.